

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 5, 7, and 9 have been amended, claims 3, 4, 8, and 11-20 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 21-29 have been added. Claim 2 has been withdrawn. Accordingly, claims 1, 5-7, 9-10, and 21-29 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 21, and 27 are independent claims. Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 4 and 9 contain allowable subject matter.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments and newly added claims do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,204,659 issued to Sarma ("Sarma").

Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of allowable claim 4. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claim 1. Claims 5-7 and 9-10 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for this reason. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6-8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable U.S. Patent No. 5,204,659 issued to Sarma ("Sarma") in view of Japanese Patent Application No. 2001-109399 issued to Yamada ("Yamada").

Claim 8 has been cancelled. Applicants submit that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Hence, claims 6-7 and 10 are allowable at least because they depend from an allowable claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 6-7 and 10. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6-7 and 10 are allowable.

Added Claims

Added claims 21-29 are directed to additional features of the invention, which are not disclosed or suggested in the art of record.

Claim 21 recites, *inter alia*:

... each of unit pixels including a transistor with source/drain regions, wherein *the drain regions* of the transistors of the B, G and B unit pixels are of a construction having *a same width and a different length from one another* (emphasis added)

Sarma fails to teach or suggest such features. The Office Action states that "the drain elements of 734, 744, 754, and 764 are the drain electrode as well as the drain regions since drain electrodes without drain regions would not properly function as TFTs" (page 2).

Applicants respectfully disagree. Although drain regions and drain electrodes are both part of TFTs, Sarma's drain elements 734, 744, 754, and 764 are drain electrodes. And drain electrodes cannot be relied upon to also teach drain regions. Furthermore, even if the drain

regions and the drain electrodes are overlapping, drain regions and drain electrodes do not necessarily have the identical shape and size. Therefore, Sarma fails to teach or suggest at least “drain regions ... having a same width and a different length from one another.”

In addition, although Sarma discloses different-sized semiconductor islands 731, 741, 751, and 761, as well as different-sized drain elements 734, 744, 754, and 764, Sarma is silent with regard to the structure of the drain regions in the semiconductor islands 731, 741, 751, and 761. Hence, Sarma fails to teach or suggest at least “wherein the drain regions of the transistors of the B, G and B unit pixels are of a construction having a same width and a different length from one another.”

Similarly, Sarma fails to teach or suggest every feature of claim 27. Specifically, Sarma fails to teach or suggest at least “wherein the drain regions of the transistors of the R, G and B unit pixels include *offset regions having a same length and a different width* from one another.” (emphasis added).

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 21-29 are in condition for allowance.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 4 and 9 contain allowable subject matter. Claim 4 has been canceled. Claim 9 has not been amended because Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 depends from an allowable base claim and is allowable at least for this reason. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 9 is in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: May 30, 2007

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP:RTS/YYK/kbs